

QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVAN, LLP

Diane M. Doolittle (CA Bar No. 142046)
dianedoolittle@quinnemanuel.com
Sara Jenkins (CA Bar No. 230097)
sarajenkins@quinnemanuel.com
555 Twin Dolphin Drive, 5th Floor
Redwood Shores, CA 94065
Telephone: (650) 801-5000
Facsimile: (650) 801-5100

Andrew H. Schapiro (admitted *pro hac vice*)
andrewschapiro@quinnemanuel.com
Teuta Fani (admitted *pro hac vice*)
teutafani@quinnemanuel.com
191 N. Wacker Drive, Suite 2700
Chicago, IL 60606
Telephone: (312) 705-7400
Facsimile: (312) 705-7401

Stephen A. Broome (CA Bar No. 314605)
stephenbroome@quinnemanuel.com
Viola Trebicka (CA Bar No. 269526)
violatrebicka@quinnemanuel.com
Crystal Nix-Hines (CA Bar No. 326971)
crystalnixhines@quinnemanuel.com
Alyssa G. Olson (CA Bar No. 305705)
alyolson@quinnemanuel.com
865 S. Figueroa Street, 10th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90017
Telephone: (213) 443-3000
Facsimile: (213) 443-3100

Josef Ansorge (admitted *pro hac vice*)
josefansorge@quinnemanuel.com
Xi ("Tracy") Gao (CA Bar No. 326266)
tracygao@quinnemanuel.com
Carl Spilly (admitted *pro hac vice*)
carlspilly@quinnemanuel.com
1300 I Street NW, Suite 900
Washington D.C., 20005
Telephone: (202) 538-8000
Facsimile: (202) 538-8100

Jomaire Crawford (admitted *pro hac vice*)
jomairecrawford@quinnemanuel.com
51 Madison Avenue, 22nd Floor
New York, NY 10010
Telephone: (212) 849-7000
Facsimile: (212) 849-7100

Jonathan Tse (CA Bar No. 305468)
jonathantse@quinnemanuel.com
50 California Street, 22nd Floor
San Francisco, CA 94111
Telephone: (415) 875-6600
Facsimile: (415) 875-6700

Counsel for Defendant Google LLC

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, OAKLAND DIVISION

CHASOM BROWN, WILLIAM BYATT,
JEREMY DAVIS, CHRISTOPHER
CASTILLO, and MONIQUE TRUJILLO,
individually and on behalf of themselves and
all others similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

GOOGLE LLC,

Defendant.

Case No. 4:20-cv-03664-YGR-SVK

**GOOGLE LLC'S ADMINISTRATIVE
MOTION TO SEAL PORTIONS OF
GOOGLE'S RESPONSE TO THE
COURT'S OCTOBER 27, 2022 ORDER TO
SHOW CAUSE (DKT. 784)**

Judge: Hon. Susan van Keulen, USMJ

Case No. 4:20-cv-03664-YGR-SVK

GOOGLE LLC'S ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO SEAL PORTIONS
OF GOOGLE'S RESPONSE TO THE COURT'S ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE

I. INTRODUCTION

Pursuant to Civil Local Rules 7-11 and 79-5, Defendant Google LLC (“Google”) respectfully seeks to seal certain portions of Google’s Response to the Court’s October 27, 2022 Order to Show Cause, Dkt. 784 (“Google’s Response”), which contains non-public, highly sensitive and confidential business information that could affect Google’s competitive standing and may expose Google to increased security risks if publicly disclosed, including details related Google’s internal projects, internal databases, data signals, and logs, and their proprietary functionalities, as well as internal metrics, which Google maintains as confidential in the ordinary course of its business and is not generally known to the public or Google’s competitors. This information is highly confidential and should be protected.

This Administrative Motion pertains to the following information contained in Google’s Motion:

Document	Portions to be Filed Under Seal	Party Claiming Confidentiality
GOOGLE LLC’S RESPONSE TO THE COURT’S OCTOBER 27, 2022 ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE (DKT. 784)	Highlighted Portions at: Pages: i:8, i:11, i:13-19, 3:13, 3:23-24, 4:4, 4:17, 4:19, 4:22, 4:27, 5:3-5, 5:13-15, 5:20, 5:22-23, 5:25, 5:27, 6:1, 6:3, 6:5, 6:7, 6:9, 6:17-19, 6:27, 7:9-10, 7:12, 7:15-17, 7:21-23, 7:25-28, 8:1-3, 8:5-10, 8:12, 8:14-15, 8:18-26, 9:1-2, 9:4-9, 9:11-12, 9:14-16, 9:18-26, 10:1-12, 10:16-26, 10:28, 11:1-16, 11:18-20, 11:22-28, 12:1, 12:3-4, 12:6-16, 16:4-6, 16:21, 17:1-3, 17:28, 18:1-2, 18:8-9, 22:5-7, 22:10	Google
Trebicka Exhibit 2 6/17/21 Berntson Depo Trans. Excerpts	Highlighted Portions at: Pages 4:12, 4:18, 4:21, 5:5-6, 198:7, 198:18, 199:17, 201:4-5, 372:11, 372:15, 375:9, 395:24, 396:14	Google
Trebicka Exhibit 3 2/18/22 McClelland Depo Trans. Excerpts	Highlighted Portions at: Pages 230:24, 231:6-8, 231:10, 231:17-19, 231:21, 231:23-25	Google
Declaration of Vineet Kahlon	Highlighted Portions at: Pages 1:15-16, 1:20, 1:22-28, 2:5, 2:14-17, 2:19, 2:21-3:1, 3:4, 3:7-12	Google

1	Kahlon Exhibit A GOOG-CABR- 04430230	Highlighted Portions at: Seal Entirely	Google
2			
3	Kahlon Exhibit C GOOG-CABR- 04737037	Highlighted Portions at: Seal Entirely	Google
4			
5	Declaration of Xianzhi Liu	Highlighted Portions at: Pages 1:14, 1:19-28, 2:1-9, 2:11-12, 2:14-19, 2:23-27, 3:1	Google
6			
7	Liu Exhibit A GOOG-BRWN- 00858530	Highlighted Portions at: Seal Entirely	Google
8			
9	Declaration of Eric Maki	Highlighted Portions at: Pages 1:15, 1:18, 1:20, 1:22-2:15, 2:17-21, 2:26-28, 3:2-4, 3:7, 3:9, 3:11, 3:13, 3:15-20, 3:22, 3:24-25, 4:1-2, 4:4, 4:6, 4:8	Google
10			
11	Maki Exhibit A GOOG-BRWN- 00858548	Highlighted Portions at: Seal Entirely	Google
12			
13	Declaration of Eugene Lee	Highlighted Portions at: Pages 1:14, 1:17, 1:19, 1:21-26, 2:1, 2:3-7, 2:12-13, 2:15-17, 2:19-21, 2:27-28, 3:2-7, 3:10-15, 3:18-20, 3:22, 3:24-4:4, 4:6, 4:8-12, 4:15-20, 4:23-24, 4:26-27, 5:4, 5:6-22, 5:26- 6:8, 6:11-17, 6:20-25, 6:27, 7:1-2, 7:5	Google
14			
15			
16			
17	Lee Exhibit A GOOG-BRWN- 00858554	Highlighted Portions at: Seal Entirely	Google
18			
19	Lee Exhibit B GOOG-BRWN- 00858520	Highlighted Portions at: Seal Entirely	Google
20			
21	Declaration of Maciej Kuzniar	Highlighted Portions at: Pages 1:12, 1:17, 1:19, 1:22-23, 1:25-27, 2:2, 2:4, 2:9, 2:12-18, 2:20-22	Google
22			
23	Kuzniar Exhibit A GOOG-BRWN- 00858547	Highlighted Portions at: Seal Entirely	Google
24			
25	Declaration of Vasily Panferov	Highlighted Portions at: Pages 1:18, 1:20-24, 1:26-2:4, 2:7-25, 3:8-9, 3:11-13	Google
26			
27			
28	Declaration of Matthew Harren	Highlighted Portions at:	Google

	Pages 1:13, 1:15-16, 1:27-28, 2:1-2, 2:4-6, 2:10-18, 2:10-22, 2:25-26, 2:28, 3:1	
Declaration of Martin Sramek	Highlighted Portions at: Pages: 1:21, 1:26-27, 2:2, 2:9	Google
Declaration of Konstantinos Psounis	Highlighted Portions at: Pages 1-13	Google
Psounis Exhibit B GOOG-BRWN- 00858535	Highlighted Portions at: Seal Entirely	Google

II. LEGAL STANDARD

A party seeking to seal material must “establish[] that the document, or portions thereof, are privileged, protectable as a trade secret or otherwise entitled to protection under the law” (*i.e.*, is “sealable”). Civ. L.R. 79-5(b). The sealing request must also “be narrowly tailored to seek sealing only of sealable material.” *Id.*

In the context of dispositive motions, materials may be sealed in the Ninth Circuit upon a showing that there are “compelling reasons” to seal the information. *See Kamakana v. City & Cty. Of Honolulu*, 447 F.3d 1172, 1179-80 (9th Cir. 2006). However, a party seeking to seal information in a non-dispositive motion must show only “good cause.” *Id.* at 1179-80. The rationale for the lower standard with respect to non-dispositive motions is that “the public has less of a need for access to court records attached only to non-dispositive motions because these documents are often unrelated, or only tangentially related, to the underlying cause of action” and that as a result “[t]he public policies that support the right of access to dispositive motions, and related materials, do not apply with equal force to non-dispositive materials.” *Kamakana*, 447 F.3d at 1179; *see also TVIIM, LLC v. McAfee, Inc.*, 2015 WL 5116721, at *1 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 28, 2015) (“Records attached to nondispositive motions are not subject to the strong presumption of access.”) (citation omitted). Under the “good cause” standard, courts will seal statements reporting on a company’s users, sales, investments, or other information that is ordinarily kept secret for competitive purposes. *See*

1 *Hanginout, Inc. v. Google, Inc.*, 2014 WL 1234499, at *1 (S.D. Cal. Mar. 24, 2014); *Nitride*
 2 *Semiconductors Co. v. RayVio Corp.*, 2018 WL 10701873, at *1 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 1, 2018) (granting
 3 motion to seal “[c]onfidential and proprietary information regarding [Defendant]’s products” under
 4 “good cause” standard) (Van Keulen, J.). Although the materials that Google seeks to seal here
 5 easily meet the higher “compelling reasons” standard, the Court need only consider whether these
 6 materials meet the lower “good cause” standard.

7 **III. THE ABOVE IDENTIFIED MATERIALS SHOULD ALL BE SEALED**

8 Courts have repeatedly found it appropriate to seal documents that contain “business
 9 information that might harm a litigant’s competitive standing.” *Nixon v. Warner Commc’ns, Inc.*,
 10 435 U.S. 589, 589-99 (1978). Good cause to seal is shown when a party seeks to seal materials that
 11 “contain[] confidential information about the operation of [the party’s] products and that public
 12 disclosure could harm [the party] by disclosing confidential technical information.” *Digital Reg of*
 13 *Texas, LLC v. Adobe Sys., Inc.*, 2014 WL 6986068, at *1 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 10, 2014). Materials that
 14 could harm a litigant’s competitive standing may be sealed even under the “compelling reasons”
 15 standard. *See e.g., Icon-IP Pty Ltd. v. Specialized Bicycle Components, Inc.*, 2015 WL 984121, at
 16 *2 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 4, 2015) (information “is appropriately sealable under the ‘compelling reasons’
 17 standard where that information could be used to the company’s competitive disadvantage”)
 18 (citation omitted). Courts in this district have also determined that motions to seal may be granted
 19 as to potential trade secrets. *See, e.g. United Tactical Sys., LLC v. Real Action Paintball, Inc.*, 2015
 20 WL 295584, at *3 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 21, 2015) (rejecting argument against sealing “that [the party]
 21 ha[s] not shown that the substance of the information . . . amounts to a trade secret”).

22 Here, Google’s Response comprises confidential and proprietary information regarding
 23 highly sensitive features of Google’s internal systems and operations that Google does not share
 24 publicly. Specifically, this information provides details related to Google’s internal projects and
 25 data logging systems, and their proprietary functionalities, as well as internal metrics. Such
 26 information reveals Google’s internal strategies, system designs, and business practices for
 27 operating and maintaining many of its important services while complying with its legal and privacy
 28 obligations.

Public disclosure of the above-listed information would harm Google’s competitive standing it has earned through years of innovation and careful deliberation, by revealing sensitive aspects of Google’s proprietary systems, strategies, and designs to Google’s competitors. That alone is a proper basis to seal such information. *See, e.g., Free Range Content, Inc. v. Google Inc.*, No. 14-cv-02329-BLF, Dkt. No. 192, at 3-9 (N.D. Cal. May 3, 2017) (granting Google’s motion to seal certain sensitive business information related to Google’s processes and policies to ensure the integrity and security of a different advertising system); *Huawei Techs., Co. v. Samsung Elecs. Co.*, No. 3:16-cv-02787-WHO, Dkt. No. 446, at 19 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 30, 2019) (sealing confidential sales data because “disclosure would harm their competitive standing by giving competitors insight they do not have”); *Trotsky v. Travelers Indem. Co.*, 2013 WL 12116153, at *8 (W.D. Wash. May 8, 2013) (granting motion to seal as to “internal research results that disclose statistical coding that is not publicly available”).

Moreover, if publicly disclosed, malicious actors may use such information to seek to compromise Google’s data logging infrastructure. Google would be placed at an increased risk of cyber security threats. *See, e.g., In re Google Inc. Gmail Litig.*, 2013 WL 5366963, at *3 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 25, 2013) (sealing “material concern[ing] how users’ interactions with the Gmail system affects how messages are transmitted” because if made public, it “could lead to a breach in the security of the Gmail system”). The security threat is an additional reason for this Court to seal the identified information.

The information Google seeks to redact, including information related to Google’s internal projects and data logging systems, and their proprietary functionalities, as well as internal metrics, is the minimal amount of information needed to protect its internal systems and operations from being exposed to not only its competitors but also to nefarious actors who may improperly seek access to and disrupt these systems and operations. The “good cause” rather than the “compelling reasons” standard should apply but under either standard, Google’s sealing request is warranted.

IV. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, the Court should seal the identified portions of Google’s Response.

1
2 DATED: November 30, 2022

QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART &
SULLIVAN, LLP

3 By /s/ Andrew H. Schapiro

4 Andrew H. Schapiro (admitted *pro hac vice*)
andrewschapiro@quinnemanuel.com
5 191 N. Wacker Drive, Suite 2700
Chicago, IL 60606
6 Telephone: (312) 705-7400
7 Facsimile: (312) 705-7401

8 Stephen A. Broome (CA Bar No. 314605)
stephenbroome@quinnemanuel.com
9 Viola Trebicka (CA Bar No. 269526)
violatrebicka@quinnemanuel.com
10 Crystal Nix-Hines (CA Bar No. 326971)
crystalnixhines@quinnemanuel.com
11 865 S. Figueroa Street, 10th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90017
12 Telephone: (213) 443-3000
13 Facsimile: (213) 443-3100

14 Diane M. Doolittle (CA Bar No. 142046)
dianedoolittle@quinnemanuel.com
15 555 Twin Dolphin Drive, 5th Floor
Redwood Shores, CA 94065
16 Telephone: (650) 801-5000
17 Facsimile: (650) 801-5100

18 Josef Ansorge (admitted *pro hac vice*)
josefansorge@quinnemanuel.com
19 1300 I. Street, N.W., Suite 900
Washington, D.C. 20005
20 Telephone: 202-538-8000
21 Facsimile: 202-538-8100

22 Jomaire A. Crawford (admitted *pro hac vice*)
jomairecrawford@quinnemanuel.com
23 51 Madison Avenue, 22nd Floor
New York, NY 10010
24 Telephone: (212) 849-7000
Facsimile: (212) 849-7100

25 Jonathan Tse (CA Bar No. 305468)
jonathantse@quinnemanuel.com
26 50 California Street, 22nd Floor
San Francisco, CA 94111
27 Telephone: (415) 875-6600
28 Facsimile: (415) 875-6700

Attorneys for Defendant Google LLC

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28